



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,918	07/22/2003	Hoo-min Toong	023.P017	7115
43831 7590 10/08/2009 BERKELEY LAW & TECHNOLOGY GROUP, LLP 17933 NW Evergreen Parkway, Suite 250 BEAVERTON, OR 97006				
EXAMINER				
WASSUM, LUKE S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2167				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/08/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/624,918

Applicant(s)

TOONG ET AL.

Examiner

Luke S. Wassum

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8500)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20090406/20090504/20090824

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Applicants' amendment, filed 9 June 2009, has been received, entered into the record, and considered.
2. As a result of the amendment, claims 1, 11, 24 and 29-40 have been amended. Claims 1-40 remain pending in the application.

Priority

3. The Applicants' claim to domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) to provisional U.S. Patent Application 60/397,542, filed 22 July 2002, is acknowledged.
4. The examiner notes, however, that the provisional application is substantially more limited in its teaching than the instant application. At the least, the provisional application fails to disclose any aspect of analysis involving non-patent publications, association of times with data elements, and also fails to disclose any graphical display of the analysis results.

As a result, *at least* claims 4-10, 12, 13 and 15-17 are not entitled to the priority date of the provisional application, since the limitations claimed are not supported by the disclosure of the cited provisional application.

5. The Applicants' claim to domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120, as a continuation-in-part to U.S. Patent Application 09/645,626, filed 24 August 2000, now U.S. Patent 6,604,114, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application 09/454,457, filed 3 December 1999, now abandoned, which claims priority to provisional U.S. Patent Application 60/111,111, filed 4 December 1998, and to provisional U.S. Patent Application 60/111,112, filed 4 December 1998, is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The Applicants' Information Disclosure Statements, filed 6 April, 4 May and 24 August 2009, have been received and entered into the record. Since the Information Disclosure Statements comply with the provisions of MPEP § 609, the references cited therein have been considered by the examiner. See attached forms PTO-1449.

7. The examiner points out that there may be a typographical error on the IDS of 24 August 2009. The USPGPub document 2003/0168547 is cited. The IDS identifies the

inventors as **BOYLES et al.**, when in fact the inventor of PGPub 2003/0168547 is **Komuro et al.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. In view of the Applicants' amendments to the claims, the pending claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

9. In view of the Applicants' amendments to the claims, the pending claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-9, 11-16 and 18-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Rivette et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,339,767).
12. Regarding claim 1, **Rivette et al.** teaches a method of searching a database of data elements as claimed, the method comprising:
- a) based on a starting data element, identifying a first set of one or more data elements in the database at least partially identified using a special purpose computer, the data elements of the first set being referenced by the starting data element (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10, as well as identifying for a source patent those patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figures 86 and 87);

- b) based on the first set, identifying a second set of one or more data elements in the database, the data elements of the second set referencing one or more of the data elements of the first set (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10, as well as identifying for a source patent those patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figures 86 and 87);
- c) generating data based on the data elements of the first and second sets and the relationships therebetween, at least partially generated using the special purpose computer (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular

patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10, as well as identifying for a source patent those patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figures 86 and 87); and

d) the second set being identified by at least two generations of search queries at least partially identified using the special purpose computer, in which any successive search query in comparison with the immediately preceding search query is capable of being contracted, expanded and/or otherwise modified to include one or more generations of interrelated data elements without any human intervention (see disclosure that the patent citation report can be performed and displayed in a recursive fashion with an operator specified depth, col. 88, line 65 through col. 89, line 21).

13. Regarding claim 11, **Rivette et al.** teaches a method of searching a database to identify prior art publications for a starting patent publication as claimed, the method comprising:

- a) based on the starting patent publication, identifying a first set of one or more publications in the database at least partially generated using a special purpose computer, the publications of the first set being cited by the starting patent publication (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10; see also drawing Figure 86);
- b) based on the first set, identifying a second set of one or more publications in the database, the publications of the second set citing one or more of the publications of the first set (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was

cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87);

- c) generating data based on the publications of the first and second sets and the citation relationships therebetween at least partially generated using the special purpose computer (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10, as well as identifying for a source patent those patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figures 86 and 87); and
- d) the second set being identified by at least two generations of search queries at least partially identified using the special purpose computer, in which any successive search query in comparison with the immediately preceding search query is capable of being contracted, expanded and/or otherwise modified to include one or more generations of interrelated data elements

without any human intervention (see disclosure that the patent citation report can be performed and displayed in a recursive fashion with an operator specified depth, col. 88, line 65 through col. 89, line 21).

14. Regarding claim 24, **Rivette et al.** teaches a processor program adapted to be executed on a special purpose computer, the special purpose computer is executing the processor program is adapted to search a database to identify prior art publications for a starting patent publication as claimed, the processor program being stored on a processor readable medium and comprising instructions to cause the processor to:

- a) based on the starting patent publication, identify a first set of one or more publications in the database at least partially using a special purpose computer, the publications of the first set being cited by the starting publication (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a

source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10; see also drawing Figure 86);

b) based on the first set, identify a second set of one or more publications in the database, the publications of the second set citing one or more of the publications of the first set (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87);

c) generate data based on the publications of the first and second sets and the relationship therebetween at least partially using the special purpose computer (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through

col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10, as well as identifying for a source patent those patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figures 86 and 87); and

d) wherein said instructions are further capable of causing the processor to identify the second set by any number of generations of search queries at least partially using the special purpose computer, in which any successive search query in comparison with the immediately preceding search query is capable of being contracted, expanded and/or otherwise modified to include one or more generations of interrelated data elements without any human intervention (see disclosure that the patent citation report can be performed and displayed in a recursive fashion with an operator specified depth, col. 88, line 65 through col. 89, line 21).

15. Regarding claim 2, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein identifying a first set of one or more data elements includes determining whether the

starting data element includes one or more references to one or more other data elements and identifying a first set of one or more data elements based on the references (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10; see also drawing Figure 86).

16. Regarding claim 3, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein identifying a second set of one or more data elements includes determining whether one or more data elements in the database include one or more references to one or more of the data elements of the first set and identifying a second set of one or more data elements based on the references (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which

the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87).

17. Regarding claim 4, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein the starting data element is associated with a starting time and wherein identifying a first set of one or more data elements includes identifying data elements referenced by the starting data element and associated with first times earlier than the starting time (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents which were cited during prosecution of the selected patent [backwards citation report], col. 87, lines 4-10; see also drawing Figure 86; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63).

18. Regarding claim 5, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein identifying the second set of one or more data elements includes identifying data

elements that reference the data elements of the first set and that are associated with second times later than the first times (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63).

19. Regarding claim 6, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein identifying the second set of one or more data elements includes identifying data elements that reference the data elements of the first set and that are associated with second times later than the first times and earlier than the starting time (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4

through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63).

20. Regarding claims 7 and 14, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method further comprising providing the generated data to one or more of a user and a display (see drawing Figures 157-164).

21. Regarding claims 8 and 15, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method further comprising graphically displaying data elements of the first and second sets and the relationships therebetween (see drawing Figure 164).

22. Regarding claims 9 and 16, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein the publications are represented by geometric shapes and wherein the relationships are represented by lines between geometric shapes (see drawing Figure 164).

23. Regarding claims 12 and 13, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein the publications include one or more of patent publications and non-patent publications and wherein the patent publications include one or more of issued patents, published patent applications and non-published patent applications (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40).

24. Regarding claim 18, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method further comprising based on the second set, identifying one or more candidate patent publications for one or more of invalidating prior art for the starting patent publication, licensing opportunities and seminal prior art (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and

retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14).

25. Regarding claims 19 and 25, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method and processor program wherein identifying one or more candidate patent publications for invalidating prior art includes identifying one or more patent publications in the second set that do not cite the starting patent publication that are not cited by the starting patent publication and that are associated with filing dates earlier than the starting patent publication (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of

the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14).

26. Regarding claims 20 and 26, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method and processor program wherein identifying one or more candidate patent publications for licensing opportunities includes identifying one or more patent publications that are associated with a first assignee and that are cited by one or more patent publications associated with one or more different second assignees (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14, and specifically the disclosure of identification of potential licensees at col. 103, lines 37-58).

27. Regarding claims 21 and 27, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method and processor program wherein identifying one or more candidate patent publications for seminal prior art includes identifying one or more patent publications that cite a first number of patent publications that cite a first number of patent publications and that are cited by a second number of patent publications, wherein the second number is greater than the first number (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14).

28. Regarding claims 22 and 28, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method and processor program further comprising based on the second set, identifying one or more co-citing patent publications, the co-citing patent publications including patent publications of the second set that are associated with one or more of filing dates later than the filing date of the starting patent publication and publication dates later than the filing date of the starting patent publication (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14).

29. Regarding claim 23, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method further comprising based on the co-citing patent publications, determining a patent prosecution

strategy including one or more of filing one or more claims in a pending application, filing one or more continuing applications of a parent application, declaring one or more interferences and disclosing one or more of the co-citing patent publications to a patent-granting office (see disclosure of the PatentRef table storing information on U.S. Patents cited during the prosecution of a given patent, col. 60, line 59 through col. 61, line 6; see also element 4028 in drawing Figure 40; see also detailed description of the Patent Citation Module, col. 87, line 4 through col. 89, line 53, which operates to identify, for a particular patent [called a source patent], the patents in which the source patent was cited [forward citation report], col. 87, lines 11-15; see also drawing Figure 87; see also disclosure that filing date is included in the Patent Bibliographic Database, col. 18, lines 55-66; see also disclosure of extensive search and retrieval functionality and its relation to patent groups, col. 26 line 38 through col. 31, line 63; see also disclosure of the use of patent citation analysis in competitive analysis and strategic planning, col. 103, line 24 through col. 108, line 14).

30. Regarding claims 29-40, **Rivette et al.** additionally teaches a method and processor program wherein said generations of search queries, without user intervention, comprises using one or more queries generated by an application, generated primarily by an application, generated by an computing platform application

and generated by a computer application (see Figure 86, disclosing that in step 8610, patents cited by each of the patents by reference to the PatentRef table are identified, the claimed application being anticipated by the disclosed patent citation module).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

31. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

32. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

33. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

34. Claims 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rivette et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,339,767) as applied to claims 1-9, 11-16 and 18-40 above, and further in view of **Coleman et al.** ("Aesthetics-Based Graph Layout for Human Consumption").

35. Regarding claims 10 and 17, **Rivette et al.** teaches a method of searching a database of data elements to identify prior art publications for a starting patent publication substantially as claimed.

Rivette et al. does not explicitly teach a method further comprising determining locations at which to display the geometric shapes and lines to reduce overlaps between geometric shapes and crossings between lines.

Coleman et al., however, teaches a method further comprising determining locations at which to display the geometric shapes and lines to reduce overlaps between geometric shapes and crossings between lines (see disclosure of a number of common-sense rules for drawing aesthetically pleasing graphs, section 2.1 Layout Aesthetics, beginning on page 1417).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate rules for drawing aesthetically pleasing graphs, since this would result in a graph that maximized the measure of desirability, or aesthetic, in the resulting graph layout (see Summary, page 1415, et seq.).

Response to Arguments

36. Applicant's arguments filed 9 June 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

37. Regarding the Applicants' argument that the **Rivette et al.** reference cannot be read to show or illustrate at least some of the recited features, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Applicants have amended their claims to address 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112 issues. Beyond this, the only amendment was to substitute the term 'search query' for 'search'.

The claim language requires the automatic formulation of queries which are capable of retrieving 'generations' of interrelated data elements. In the case of the **Rivette et al.** reference, these interrelated generations of data elements are a series of generations of patent documents, related by being either referenced by an 'antecedent' patent document, or by themselves referencing a 'subsequent' patent document.

This capability is disclosed at, for instance, col. 88, lines 65-67, where it is disclosed that the patent citation report can be performed and displayed in a recursive fashion with an operator specified depth. Furthermore, at col. 89, lines 18-20, it is

disclosed that the level of the report desired by the operator could be contained in the information that the patent citation module receives in the initial step where the source patents are specified by the user.

The execution of recursive queries to retrieve multiple generations of cited/citing patent documents anticipates the Applicants' claimed invention.

Furthermore, the Applicants state only that the **Rivette et al.** reference cannot be read to show or illustrate 'at least some' of these features, while not pointing out specifically which limitations are not met, nor explaining why the prior art fails to disclose the feature(s). As such, these arguments are not persuasive. The rejections of record are maintained.

Conclusion

38. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke S. Wassum whose telephone number is 571-272-4119. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

In addition, INFORMAL or DRAFT communications may be faxed directly to the examiner at 571-273-4119, or sent via email at luke.wassum@uspto.gov, **with a previous written authorization in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 502.03. Such communications must be clearly marked as INFORMAL, DRAFT or UNOFFICIAL.**

Customer Service for Tech Center 2100 can be reached during regular business hours at (571) 272-2100, or fax (571) 273-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



/Luke S. Wassum/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167